THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VI. MARCH, 1926. No. 3.

Exposition of the Sedes Doctrinae of the Lord's Supper.

REV. W. J. SCHROEDER, Bonduel, Wis.

The words of institution of the Lord's Supper have, in the history of the Christian Church, been the subject of much controversy and dispute. Although it would appear that any one who peruses these words with an unbiased mind cannot fail to arrive at the one true intended meaning, nevertheless these words have been subjected to various interpretations, with the result that much scandal and dissension have thereby been perpetrated within the Church and that the minds of many Christians have been bewildered and confused. It strikes one as being rather strange that, in connection with these clear passages of Holy Writ, there has been such wanton deviation from the safe and sane rule of interpretation, *viz.*, that, in expounding Scripture, one must not depart from the plain, simple, common, and established meaning of the words in question unless there be sufficient grounds to warrant such departure. The reason for all such deviation in interpreting the words of institution of the Lord's Supper, however, lies in the fact that reason has ever been consulted as to the comprehensibility of the simple import of these words; and finding that the simple meaning of the words lies beyond the grasp of human reason, this meaning has been rejected, and the words have been interpreted according to the dictates of reason. Reason, however, does not furnish sufficient grounds for departing from the aforementioned rule; Scripture itself must make the deviation imperative. And thus, in seeming keeping with this requirement and in a vain endeavor to give a human fabrication the appearance of a Scriptural doctrine, other passages of Holy Writ have erroneously been regarded as the seat of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. As the Baptists have sought to give their false doctrine of Baptism Scriptural support from Rom. 10, 14: "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" just so the Reformed church-bodies

have resorted to the 6th chapter of the Gospel of St. John in search of Scriptural proof of their doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

Now, it is not the purpose of this paper to show in detail which are, and which are not, the words of institution of the Holy Supper. However, since chapter 6 of St. John's gospel has constantly been misapplied to disprove the clear meaning of the essential part of the actual words of institution, it may be well, before taking up the theme, to state briefly a few reasons why this passage of Scripture does not treat of the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood. In the first place, these words were spoken by the Lord about one year before the time of His actual institution of the Holy Supper. Again, no earthly elements are here mentioned, whereas such elements are essential to constitute a Sacrament; neither do we here find any reference to a bodily eating and drinking, which is another essential part of the Sacrament according to the clear words of institution. Furthermore, the assumption that these words treat of the Lord's Supper results in the following, *viz.:* 1) That no one can be saved unless he has partaken of the Lord's Supper; for, applied to the Lord's Supper, such must be the meaning of Christ's words in the 53d verse: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you"; 2) that every communicant has eternal life; for in the following verse Jesus says: "Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life." Accordingly, all who depart this life before partaking of Holy Communion, which is often the case, especially with children, perish eternally, regardless of whether they believe in Jesus or not; and on the other hand, communing saves, be the communicant worthy or unworthy, a believer or an unbeliever. All this, however, is so directly contrary to the clear teachings of Scripture that it appears superfluous to cite passages in refutation thereof. Of the malefactor on the cross, although he had never communed, we know that he entered Paradise after death, Luke 23, 43; of Christian children who die in faith before partaking of the Lord's Supper Jesus gives us the same assurance, saying: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," Mark 16, 16; and of the unworthy communicant St. Paul says, "He eateth and drinketh damnation to himself," 1 Cor. 11, 29. Holding fast, then, what the Scriptures plainly teach, it becomes clear and certain that chapter 6 of the Gospel of St. John does not treat of the Sacrament of the Altar, but speaks of a spiritual eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood, *i. e.,* of an appropriation of the merits of the Lord's suffering

and death, which is done by faith. Indeed, the entire disputed portion of this chapter of St. John's gospel speaks of faith, sometimes expressly, as in verses 35, 40, 47, *et al.;* sometimes figuratively, as in verses 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, *et al.*

The words of institution of the Lord's Supper in which the true doctrine of this Sacrament is to be sought, are none other than the quaint words which the Lord spoke in the same night in which He was betrayed. Of these words we have a fourfold record. It has pleased the Holy Spirit to have these words repeated by four of His inspired penmen: Matthew, Mark, Luke, and St. Paul. The purpose of the repetition is nicely stated in our Small Catechism thus: "That they [these words] may be unto us all the more clear, sure, and important."

The following are the words as we find them in the various records. Matthew states them thus: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take eat; this is My body. And He took the cup and gave thanks and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is My blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matt. 26, 26—28. Mark writes thus: "And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat; this is My body. And He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them; and they all drank of it. And He said unto them, This is My blood of the new testament, which is shed for many." Mark 14, 22—24. Luke has the words thus: "And He took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is My body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in My blood, which is shed for you." Luke 22, 19. 20. St. Paul writes as follows: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread; and when He had given thanks, He brake it and said, Take, eat; this is My body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner also He took the cup when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in My blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me." 1 Cor. 11, 23—25.

While a comparison of these passages with each other manifests a great similarity among them, especially between the words of Matthew and Mark, and those of Luke and St. Paul, respectively, yet it is true that the four records do not harmonize with each

other verbally. Even in the words which the Lord spake while distributing the elements, bread and wine, there is a slight difference among the four records. But while there is an apparent difference in the wording of the various records, there is no difference as far as their import is concerned. Considering their import, these passages rather coincide with each other perfectly. No matter how one studies or examines them, whether separately or jointly, one will gain identically the same doctrine therefrom.

Nevertheless, the opponents of the true doctrine have ever attempted to find in the existing verbal difference among the records sufficient ground for circumventing the words of institution and for resorting to other passages of Scripture for proof of their false doctrine. They say that it is impossible to determine which are the *ipsissima verba Jesu Christi,* impossible to determine which are the very words the Lord actually used at the time of institution. And from this they draw the conclusion that, in formulating the doctrine, a strict adherence to the individual words in these passages is unessential. To this latter bold assertion we answer: Study each passage separately, and the result, in each instance, will be, as already stated, the same doctrine. Moreover, it is not true that we cannot determine which are the very, the actual, words of Christ. The sainted Dr. Stoeckhardt gives a plausible explanation in regard to this when he writes in his *Bible History of the New Testament,* p. 266: "In making the round among the disciples, the Lord sometimes used the one and sometimes the other formula. No matter, however, which words He chose to use, in each instance the import thereof was the same." But even granting that this explanation is only a matter of conjecture, the unimpeachable fact remains that each passage, whether written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, or St. Paul, is a true reiteration of the *ipsissima verba Jesu Christi,* and that verbatim; for these men framed not their own thoughts or speculations in their own words, wrote not from their own memory, but were inspired by the Holy Ghost. The verbal inspiration of Scripture, taught by the Bible in and of itself, 1 Cor. 2, 13, applies in its fullest measure also to these words of Holy Writ. Hence, when asked which are the very, the actual, words of Christ, we can safely say: All the words of each and every passage are the *ipsissima verba Jesu Christi.*

In expounding the *sedes doctrinae* of the Lord's Supper, we may, then, choose any one of the four passages as the basis of our exposition. We will expound the record of St. Paul, which is not only the most detailed, but also the oldest, it being written about

57 A. D., while none of the gospels was written before 60 A. D. We shall, however, take cognizance of the verbal differences between this and the other passages in their proper order.

The apostle begins with the words: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you" — *Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν.* The particle *γάρ* indicates that the following is an explanation of, and a reason for, the foregoing. In the preceding verses the apostle rebukes the Corinthians because of their corrupt practise and the conduct shown at their public services. Discord, divisions, and schisms among them were apparent there; instead of "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," Eph. 4, 3, they entered into strife and wrangling with one another, and thus their coming together for divine worship did not benefit and better them, but rather harmed them. But worst of all, the apostle must charge them also with abuse and profanation of the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. This they celebrated in connection with their love-feasts. From the contributions toward these love-feasts the necessary bread and wine for the Lord's Supper was to be taken. This, however, was not done. Instead, every one ate and drank his own contribution, as the apostle says: "In eating, every one taketh before other his own supper," v. 21; consequently "one was hungry, and another was drunken," according as each had brought. And so it happened that not only the feast itself had lost its charity character, — the poor being despised and deprived of that which was to be contributed toward their benefit, — but that the holy Sacrament was also scandalously abused. Therefore the apostle, for the purpose of curbing the existing corrupt practise, finds it necessary to remind the Corinthians, in the following verses, of the sacredness of the divine ordinance. It was not being celebrated by the Corinthians in a manner consistent with its divine character. Nor is the manner in which it is celebrated immaterial. The Christian congregation is not privileged to act in this sacred matter according to its own notion and fancy. The Holy Supper is not an ordinance founded and established by the Church; it is of divine institution, an ordinance of God, instituted by the Lord Himself. "For," says the apostle, "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you."

"Of the Lord" the apostle received that which he delivered to the Corinthians. At the outset he assures them, and confirms them in their belief, that that which he had long since delivered

to them is not his own, not a mere human ordinance, but that it is of divine origin, an institution of the Lord. In the same breath he also states how he came by the knowledge thereof: he *received it of the Lord, i. e.,* by special, direct revelation. Some deny this. They hold that the apostle merely wishes to say that the record of the institution of the Sacrament had been communicated to him as being of divine origin, as a word of God, and that he, in turn, had communicated it to the Corinthians as such. They say that tradition was the source of Paul's knowledge of the record, that the first disciples, the eye-witnesses of the institution, had related these facts to him. They base their claim upon Paul's use of the preposition *ἀπό,* contending that, if the apostle had intended to refer to an immediate revelation, this would have necessitated the use of the preposition *παρά.* Now, it is true that Paul, in connection with the word *παραλαμβάνειν,* in other instances, does use the preposition *παρά* to state of whom one has received. Gal. 1, 12; 1 Thess. 4, 1; 2 Thess. 3, 6. Nevertheless, the idea of an indirect, or mediate, communication finds no support in the connection of this passage. Why should the apostle emphasize that he had received the record of the institution of the Lord's Supper merely as one of divine origin, as a word of God? There was not a particle of doubt as to this in the minds of the readers of his letter. Why, then, lay such special stress upon something which every one already believed? Why the use of the pronoun *ἐγώ,* and that at the beginning of the sentence? Does not the apostle thereby wish to emphasize, by means of contrast, the special privilege which had been conferred upon him in that he, as an apostle of Jesus Christ, had received an immediate, direct revelation from the Lord while others had not? Many had heard and received the record of the institution as a word of God by tradition, from the first disciples. To say that he, the apostle, had come by the knowledge thereof in like commonplace manner would have been nothing special, exceptional, or noteworthy; and in such case the use of the pronoun *ἐγώ* would have been insignificant, yes, the entire sentence would have been superfluous. But no; Paul had received the record immediately, directly, from the Lord — by direct revelation. This is the intended meaning of the apostle's statement, as the connection indicates. As the apostle at other times emphasizes the fact that he had received his Gospel, not from man, but by direct revelation of the Lord, Gal. 1, 12, so also here. Nor does the use of the preposition *ἀπό* prohibit the acceptance of this as the intended meaning. In other passages of the New Testament

this preposition is used in the same sense, *viz.*, to indicate direct communication; cf. Col. 1, 7; 1 John 1, 5. Thus we have before us in these words of St. Paul not a traditional, but the Lord's own word and record of the institution of His Last Supper. And "in this circumstance," writes Chemnitz, "lies the highest authority of Paul's testimony," *viz.*, in this, "that he did not take his description of the institution from the other apostles, so that he, by virtue of his apostolic authority, might have changed, transposed, and explained some of the words; but the Son of God Himself, after His ascension into glory, communicated the institution of His Supper to Paul, so that he might, by repetition of some words, and by change, transposition, and explanation of others, manifest how he would have them explained and understood." (*L. C.*, p. 43.)

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you," thus the apostle writes to the Christians at Corinth. As their apostle, as a faithful steward, Paul delivered, communicated to them the revelation which he had received. He delivered it to them verbatim, without adding thereto or taking therefrom. What he had received he communicated to them just as he had received it, namely, this, "That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread," etc. — *ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον.* In these first words of the revelation the attention of the Corinthians is directed to the institutor of the Sacrament. It is none other than Jesus, the Son of God and man, the Savior. And this Jesus is the Lord, the true God, the all-wise God, who knows not only what He says and whereof He speaks, but also how He must speak in order that man may not fail to arrive at the true import of His words, if he will but accept them according to their simple meaning. Being the Lord, He is also truthful; truthfulness is one of His inherent qualities, wherefore guile or falsehood never was, and never can be found, in Him. What He says He fulfils to the letter. And even though reason may marvel at the substance of His word and promise and say, It cannot be so nor done, yet one may rely upon the fulfilment thereof with implicit trust; for He is the Lord, the Omnipotent One, with whom nothing is impossible. — Having thus reminded his readers of the divine origin of the Sacrament, to wit, that it was instituted by the Lord Jesus, the apostle proceeds to state the time of the institution. It took place in the night in which He, the Lord Jesus, was betrayed, — betrayed in such contemptible manner by His own disciple Judas Iscariot;

in the night which preceded that memorable day when Jesus, as the Lamb of God, burdened with the sins of the whole world, went forth on that painful journey which terminated in His crucifixion and death on Mount Calvary. In reminding the Corinthians of the circumstances attending the institution and of the momentous occurrences of the following day by designating the time as being the night of the Lord's betrayal, it is unquestionably the object and purpose of the apostle to rebuke the Corinthians because of the indifference and disorder which attended their celebration of the Holy Supper. He calls their attention to the fact that the Lord's Supper is a sacred institution; as such it demands due reverence and respect on the part of the Christians. It is the Lord's last will, or testament, wherein He bequeathed to His people the benefits and merits of His suffering and death. *(To be continued.)*

What If Jesus Were Only a Man?

Rev. F. J. Lankenau, Napoleon, O.

(Concluded.)

I desire to quote one more text in illustration of the conviction of Christ's deity which those had who companied with Him while He passed up and down Jewry, preaching His Gospel and performing His miracles of mercy. In his First Epistle, John declares in unequivocal words: "This [Jesus Christ] is the true God and eternal Life." 1 John 5, 20. In calling attention to this passage, I am fully aware of the fact that there is a difference of opinion as to whether the demonstrative "this" has for its antecedent "Him that is true," "the Faithful One," that is, the Father, or "His Son Jesus Christ." However, the apparently intended progress of thought as well as general linguistic usage seem to make it compulsory to accept the phrase "His Son Jesus Christ" as the antecedent of "this." We shall give the whole of v. 20 and also v. 21: "And we know that the Son of God is come and hath given us an understanding that we may know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal Life. Little children, keep yourselves from idols. Amen." It surely seems most natural to accept "His Son Jesus Christ" as the antecedent of "this," for the simple reason that of the possible antecedents it is nearest, and general usage favors accepting the nearest possible antecedent, unless some other possible antecedent is the subject of the preceding clause or is

particularly emphasized. Thus in 1 John 2, 2 "He" has for its antecedent "Jesus Christ the Righteous," the last-named person, while in 1 John 2, 22 "He" has for its antecedent the subject of the preceding clause. In Acts 4, 10. 11 we have an example where "He" has for its antecedent the most remote of three mentioned persons, because the whole emphasis rests on the fact that the lame man mentioned was made whole by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth. In our text, now, we find that "His Son Jesus Christ" is the nearest possible antecedent, and the possible antecedent bearing the emphasis. A careful reading of the text shows that John wishes to emphasize the fact that we have our understanding and knowledge of Him that is true through the Son, and that we are in Him that is true, that is, in the Father, because we are in His Son Jesus Christ. Then, also, the logical sequence of thought speaks in favor of accepting "His Son Jesus Christ" as the antecedent of "this." To accept "Him that is true" as the antecedent of "this" would have us say in this concluding clause of v. 20 what we have already said twice before in the same verse, namely, that the Father is the true God: "He that is the true God is the true God." Is it not unreasonable to think that the apostle is guilty of such tautology? On the other hand, if we accept "His Son Jesus Christ" as the antecedent of "this," we have a logical sequence of thought in the verse under consideration: Through Christ, the Son of God, we have an understanding of Him that is true, and in and through Christ we have communion with Him that is true, and this Jesus Christ, who has revealed unto us the knowledge of His Father and has brought us into blessed communion with Him, is Himself true God. The second predicate of the clause, "and eternal life," also points to "His Son Jesus Christ" as the antecedent of "this": for again and again John in His gospel insists that only in Christ is eternal life to be found, and he explicitly calls Jesus Eternal Life, a term which he never uses in designating the Father. John 1, 4; 11, 25; 14, 6; 20, 31; comp. also 1 John 1, 2; 4, 9. Finally, it has been pointed out that this acceptance of the sense of v. 20 gives real point to v. 21, as an earnest warning against those false prophets whom he has referred to in previous chapters of this epistle, 2, 18, etc.; 4, 1, etc. It is as though he would say: "Children, Christ with the Father is true God; to deny Him is to deny the Father and not to have God. But not to have God is to have an idol, a figment of the mind, and to serve such an idol is idolatry. 'Little children, keep yourselves from idols!'"

Equally as strong as the testimony of the apostles who com-

panied with Jesus while He was visibly present on earth is that of Paul as to our Savior's deity.

When saying farewell to the elders of Ephesus, Acts 20, 28, Paul, in conclusion, admonishes them: "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." God is here said to have purchased His Church with His own blood. He that purchased His Church with His own blood, Jesus Christ, is here declared to be God. Of course, it is a matter of dispute whether it should read "Church of God" or "Church of the Lord." Most of the uncials have *kyriou,* "Lord," but the evidence for *theou,* "God," as the correct reading is by far the weightier because of the fact that the two oldest manuscripts, the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus, have *theou.* Then, too, the phrase "Church of God" is not infrequently used by the apostle, while one would look in vain for the expression "Church of the Lord" in all of Paul's epistles.

Rom. 9, 5 the apostle writes: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen." After recounting various high distinctions of the Jews as a race, the apostle mentions the highest and crowning distinction last, namely, the descent of Christ from them concerning the flesh, who, Christ, is "over all, God blessed forever." For centuries this was the universally accepted understanding of this verse, as it certainly is the most obvious meaning according to the ordinary rules and usages of language. Only in modern days, objections have been raised to this interpretation, not so much because the words in their ordinary acceptance seemed to imply any other meaning, but simply because it has been thought that Paul could not have meant to say what the words in their natural and simple acceptance do say. To prevent its appearing as if Paul were calling Jesus "God," some have put a period after the word "flesh," *sarka,* and have called the concluding clause of the verse a doxology to God the Father: "God, who is over all, be blessed forever." Other have put a stop after "all," *panton,* leaving the rest of the verse to be a doxology. Still others want this last clause to be a statement that God the Father is blessed forever. But what can be the purpose of such a statement in this connection? While, however, a statement to the effect that the Father is blessed forever seems to be purposeless in this connection and the apostle's train

of thought does not call for a doxology to the Father, some expression of the greatness of Christ is surely demanded to set forth the crowning distinction of the Hebrew race from which Christ traces His fleshly descent, and just such an expression we have in the words "Who is over all, God blessed forever."

Compare also Paul's initial salutation in his Epistle to the Galatians, chap. 1, 1: "Paul, an apostle, *not of men, neither by man,* but *by Jesus Christ,"* etc. Paul insists upon the Galatians' fully realizing that neither the original source of his ambassadorship nor the medium of his sending was human, and yet he declares that he was sent by Jesus Christ. If words mean anything at all, then Paul here declares Jesus to be God and refers to the deity of Jesus as a proof of his apostleship.

To the Colossians Paul writes, chap. 2, 9: "In Him [Christ] dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." In Christ dwells the Godhead in all its fulness incarnate. The Godhead, the Deity, the Divine Essence, is tabernacled in Christ's body; all the essential qualities of God, His infinity, His intelligence, His holiness and righteousness, His truth and benevolence, are in Christ bodily. The essential and perfect majesty of divine essence, in all its fulness, dwells in Christ's human body. The man Christ Jesus is at the same time true God, very God with the Father and the Holy Ghost. Few words, but expressive of a stupendous mystery, the mystery of the personal union of God and man in Christ Jesus!

Titus 2, 13 we read that we are "looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." The translation would be more happy and in stricter conformity with the original if it were given as "awaiting the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ." Much is made of the fact that nowhere else the apostle speaks of Christ as "the great God"; but this can surely not be conclusive evidence that he does not wish to do so here, especially in view of the fact that this is the natural grammatical rendering, that the immediate context applies only to the Son, and that the term "glorious appearing," "epiphany," is never applied to the Father, while it does speak of the future appearing of Christ in various passages. Our "blessed hope" is the appearing in glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ.

The inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the first chapter, quotes the Second Psalm, where the Messiah is declared to be of the same nature with the Father: "Thou art *My Son;* this day have I *begotten* Thee," Ps. 2, 7, to show that Christ

is superior to the angels, Heb. 1, 5. In the sixth verse of the same chapter the angels of God are commanded to *worship* Him, to give Him the homage due only to God Most High. In the eighth verse the holy writer cites the Messianic prophecy of Ps. 45, 6. 7 to show that the title of the everlasting God belongs to Christ: "But unto the *Son* He saith, 'Thy throne, *O God,* is forever and ever; a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of Thy kingdom.'" While attempts have been made to destroy the proof of Christ's deity in this text by rendering the original, "*God is Thy throne* forever and ever," even Unitarians admit that the idiom of the Greek forbids the expression being rendered thus. The translators of the LXX understood the word "God" as a vocative and all other ancient versions also rendered it so. In Heb. 1, 10—12 the holy writer applies the words of Ps. 102, 24—27 to Christ to prove that He is really God, since He is the unchangeable Creator of all things. And, finally, the inspired author, in the thirteenth verse, brings a final and crowning quotation from Ps. 110 to show the Son's superiority to the angels: "But to which of the angels said He, 'Sit Thou at My right hand until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool'?" The Son is not merely to be enthroned on Zion as the Father's Vicegerent, but He is to sit at the right hand of God Himself, at the right hand of God's majesty on high, above the heavens and above the cherubim, and thus to all is to be shown His superiority to the angels and His equality with the Father, that is, His essential deity. Surely, as one reads these words as quoted by the author of the Epitle to the Hebrews from the Old Testament and follows his application of the inspired words to Jesus Christ, there is but one impression that one can get, and that is, that he would have us recognize Jesus to be very God, equal with the Father in glory.

But while Jesus Christ is one with the Father in essence, very God of very God, so that He can truthfully say: "I and My Father are one," John 10, 30, it is also true that there is a distinction between the Father and the Son, and this distinction in person is just as clearly taught in Scripture as is the unity of the two in essence. But this distinction is not found in a subordination of the Son to the Father. To say that the Son must be inferior to the Father because He is of the Father, is not good reasoning and contrary to human experience; for it is by no means always the case that the son is physically, mentally, or in some other way inferior to the father. But even if our range of experience gave us no instance where a son was the equal of his father, this could

not alter the fact that in the case of God the Father and God the Son there is no subordination of the latter to the former, and to deny that would be equivalent to denying that Jesus Christ, together with the Father and the Holy Ghost, is the one true God. To deny that Jesus Christ is the one true God is a denial of Col. 2, 9: "In Him dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

We, indeed, speak of the First Person and Second Person and Third Person in the Godhead and such designation is perfectly Scriptural, but it indicates no superiority or inferiority of the three Persons among each other. Since the Father is of no one, but the Son is born of the Father, and the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, it is perfectly proper to designate the three Persons as we do, First, Second, and Third.

When Jesus speaks of the Father's being greater than He, John 14, 28, He does not wish to assert that He is inferior in His essence to the Father, but simply this, that in His state of humiliation, which will end with His going to the Father, He is smaller than the Father, because of the servant's form in which He is clothed. There is as little subordination of the Son to the Father to be found in this passage as in any other.

Have I exhausted your patience, dear Doctor? I hope not. But I realize that, like all things here below, this letter will also have to come to an end, even though the line of argument we have so far pursued is by no means exhausted. Other illustrations and proofs may be found on every page of Scripture. The doctrine that Jesus Christ is very God is woven into the very texture of the Bible. If Jesus of Nazareth is not God Incarnate, then there is nothing left for us to do but to cast aside our Bibles. If Christ is not true God, He is a liar; if He is not the great Jehovah, He is an impostor.

To me it appears that the argument for Christ's deity is simply irresistible, whether we examine single texts or the Scriptures as a whole; for not only individual texts, but the books as a whole, the whole sacred collections cumulatively, bear testimony to the Godhead of Jesus. It is as if every text, every book of the Bible cried out, "Christ is God, He is the very God; to Him be glory with the Father and the Holy Ghost, world without end!"

Dear Doctor, as I am about to conclude this long letter, I cannot refrain from expressing the heartfelt prayer that you may find in Jesus of Nazareth what I find in Him, my Savior and my God!

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

"**The modesty of Falstaff** is quite as interesting as the modesty of the shrinking violet. There is, however, a distinction — a subtle difference, which is hinted at by the letter which Mr. Clinton Howard, of Rochester, N. Y., has addressed to the Holy Father. Not many men rise to fame on the strength of a single epistle; but the style of Mr. Howard is so individual that it could not escape its destiny of immediate immortality. There is an epic note in these lines: 'Our people, wishing to be a sober nation, have put into their fundamental law a decree forbidding the manufacture, sale, and distribution of intoxicants used for beverage purposes.' What an image is here of a noble, puissant nation spanking itself to sobriety with the help of a decree and an army of retainers — in which Mr. Howard is a kind of supernumerary and unofficial corporal! But the Iliad has its Cassandra, and the letter in question its moment of retrospect and prophecy: 'As a friend of Catholics, as well as spokesman of many patriotic citizens, I am filled with deep regret in bringing to the attention of Your Holiness the fact that the seeming indifference, if not opposition, on the part of so many Catholics to the enforcement of our prohibition law has created a great deal of opposition to the Catholic Church and did much to call into existence the Ku Klux Klan.' There is perhaps no effrontery like that of friendship, and, like the queen of France, most of us pray for protection against the inexhaustibly amiable. But the letter has a point, though not precisely the one emphasized by Mr. Howard. What right have the blurbs of partisanship to assume that Catholics are of one mind, either positive or negative, on a subject so wholly independent of patriotism as the Volstead Act? Many a prelate, cleric, and layman of the Church is outspokenly opposed to the manufacture and sale of liquor. But their reasons for this stand are quite different from the motives which have inspired that aggregation of the elect which Mr. Howard has codified for us under the name of the Klan. We ourselves hold that the time has come to distinguish, as intelligent men in all groups are distinguishing, between the constitutional amendment and the Volstead Act. We feel that the United States should not be hounded into legalized labyrinths, which are as absurd as they are baneful. But after all, no length of boot-straps will make Mr. Howard tall enough to insult the Catholic body. Having lectured and rebuked President Coolidge just before he assumed the rôle of adviser to the Pope, to-morrow probably he will address another letter to the President of the Modern Language Association, protesting the antiprohibitional mentality of scholars and professors. And before the week is over, he may remember to advise Santa Claus, in an ornate epistle, to avoid houses wherein the cellars are not 'soberly' dry." (*The Commonweal,* Dec. 16, 1925.) Here is sarcasm to the saturation point. The pity is that this whole miserable business has been made a church issue by Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, and others. The Protestant champions of the Volstead Act

do not seem to feel the shame of an appeal to the Pope to help them achieve what they have failed to achieve even with the aid of the anti-Catholic Klan. This episode must have been a rare treat for the Pope. The worst enemy of Protestantism could not have devised a more effectual means for letting Protestants make fools of themselves and then exhibiting them to the world in their plight than this scheme of making America bone-dry with the aid of Protestant churches. But if the outcome of this latest and humiliating episode should be, as the best men in the Church hope it will be, to take Protestantism out of politics, and especially out of this piece of politics, the price that has been paid for the lesson every Protestant has learned by this time will not be too great. Protestantism has a far greater battle to fight (and that may be soon) than with the poor "critters" who cannot keep away from liquor. The police can deal with them; the Church has greater tasks before it. DAU.

Three theories are offered for proving the end of the world as scientifically inevitable: 1. The atmosphere surrounding the earth is being exhausted, rendering life impossible. 2. Radioactivity accumulates heat that becomes lodged in the non-conducting crust of the earth and ultimately shatters our globe. 3. The entire solar system will coalesce into two stars: one, the sun as it now is; the other, all the rest of the planets, which, together with the earth, will be attracted by the Red Patch in Jupiter. This patch, observed some thirty years ago, is a new continent on that planet, which has come into existence with voracious and imperialistic proclivities. The last theory is by Prof. MacMillan of Chicago University. Before making a choice of these three, it is well to defer action, as more interesting and pleasing theories may be in the process of forming. In the mean time a study of the *μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος* in 1 Tim. 6, 4 is in season.

DAU.

"Del Beneficio di Giesu Christo Crocifisso Verso i Christiani" is the title of a *trattate utilissimo* — so it presents itself — which is commonly mentioned as *The Benefit of Christ's Death.* It was distributed in thousands of copies in Italy about the middle of the sixteenth century and translated into different languages. It is mentioned in almost all trials for heresy conducted by the judges of the Inquisition and marked as the *liber perniciosissimus.* The owners and readers of it were at once suspected of cherishing the hated doctrine of justification by faith alone. Guericke, in his *Kirchengeschichte,* Wernicke, in his *Weltgeschichte,* McCrie, in his *History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy,* p. 132, and others name Aonio Paleario, of Siena, as the author of this message of glad tidings. The *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia,* Vol. VI, p. 68, calls Paleario its probable author, but in Vol. VIII, p. 307, the title of his real book appears to be correctly stated: *Della Pienezza* [= *perfection*], *Sufficienza ed Satisfattione della Passione di Christo.* (We might remark here that the references do not agree as to orthography.) The authorship of *The Benefit of Christ's Death* is thus traced in Herzog's *Realenzyklopaedie,* Vol. IX, p. 542: "Aber

Ranke hat recht, wenn er nach dem *Compendium Inquisitorum* des A. Caraccioli vielmehr *'un monaco di San Severino'* in Neapel als den Verfasser bezeichnet, wie dieses auch Carnesechi im Prozess tut unter Nennung des Namens seines Verfassers (Don Benedetto de Mantova) und wie dieses der Maertyrer Giovanni Franzesco d'Alois aus Caserta bezeugt." Paleario may have unwittingly led historians astray by referring to his tract as his *Libellus de Morte Christi.* The Benedictine of San Severino, Benedetto, of Mantua, the author of *Del Beneficio di Giesu Christo,* was a disciple of Juan de Valdés, of Naples, who did much for the spread of the Reformation in Italy. Thus we are confronted with the agreeable fact that not only Benedetto bore witness of the Gospel in that Pope-ridden country, but also Paleario, who relates the following incident: "Being asked one day what was the first ground on which men should rest their salvation, I replied, 'Christ'; being asked what was the second, I replied, 'Christ'; and being asked what was the third, I still replied, 'Christ.'" He was martyred June 3, 1570. — The thousands of copies of Benedetto's tract were so thoroughly extirpated by the Inquisition that after thirty years none could be found in the original Italian. A single copy was finally found in Cambridge in 1853. Compare Kurtz, *Kirchengeschichte,* § 142, 23; Herzog, *Realenzyklopaedie,* Vol. XIV, p. 603; Williston Walker, *History of the Christian Church,* p. 423; Meyer, *Grosses Konversationslexikon, sub* "Paleario." B.

In view of the increasing lawlessness among the youths of our land, Dr. Chas. M. Sheldon, contributing editor to the *Christian Herald,* has proposed that in some form religion must be introduced into the public schools. In answer to this proposition the *Lutheran Church Herald* of December 15, 1925, says editorially: "It is to be a religion without theology, to which all men can subscribe. The only trouble is that such a religion does not exist and cannot be invented by any man. It is possible to agree on the main principles of ethics, and these are, in a way, taught in the schools and from a pagan point of view may be considered a religion; but it is not the Christian religion, which demands, without compromise, the acceptance of Jesus Christ as the only Savior and makes the claim that there is salvation in none other. The Christian religion is exclusive; it condemns all other religions and is absolutely unwilling to compromise with Jew or Gentile. It ought to be clear to any one that, if we are to maintain complete religious liberty and abide by the First Amendment to the Constitution providing that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' we cannot adopt a state religion for the public schools. This Constitution is a contract we have entered into with all people in the United States, including the Jew, the Mohammedan, the Buddhist, and other religionists, not to infringe upon their liberties by forcing them to pay taxes to a school which, if the Christian religion were put into the public school, would condemn their religion and form of worship. We may say we are in the majority, and we are right, and therefore let us use our power

to force the true religion upon these benighted heathens. By so doing we would break our contract and agreement with them and also act contrary to the spirit of Christianity, which does not believe in using force and compulsion. That system has been tried, and we thank God that we finally have reached so far that we have discarded the Inquisition and also all attempts to make people religious by state law, enforced by military power and the police. Either we have to change our Federal Constitution, or, as long as this remains, we must look for some other solution of the educational problems confronting us. We believe that the Constitution, which guarantees religious liberty, the first one in the world to do so, should be defended, because it is right and safeguards for us and our children religious liberty. Let us thank God for our Constitution and be governed by it also in this respect. We cannot shift the responsibility of giving our children religious education over to the state. The Christian home and the Christian Church have this duty and responsibility. The state has given us freedom to build our religious schools and our churches and does not interfere with our exercise of this freedom. We have lately, in some States, asked that the public school give up some of its time for religious instruction, and this has been granted; but the churches have not availed themselves of this opportunity as much as they should. If some of our writers would discontinue holding up before the people the false hope that we can shift religious instruction over to the State (it would be cheaper, of course) and place the responsibility upon the Church, where it belongs, there might be some hope of arousing the churches to their duty and responsibility. In one of the current numbers of the *Lutheran,* in an editorial under the caption, 'Is Religion in the Public Schools Impossible?' the editor answers the question in the affirmative and proves his statement. He writes: 'In our free country and our free public school system we have inherited a condition that makes it impossible to give religion an adequate and proper place in our public school system. We may lament it and shed tears over it, but the fact remains that, if religion is to be taught, the Church, and not the State, must be charged with that responsibility. But it also follows that, if religion cannot be taught in the public schools, neither should the State permit anything to be taught that undermines faith in religion. However churchmen may differ as to his method and manner of argument, there is where the late Mr. Bryan stood on solid ground.'" Prof. J. Bodensieck, of Dubuque, Iowa, writes on this question in the *Lutheran Herald* as follows: "According to an Associated Press dispatch of October 25 [1925], President Coolidge declared in an address before the International Convention of Young Men's Christian Associations that control of the nation's youth from the home is preferable to attempting in some way constantly to increase the Government's responsibility for rearing children. This statement certainly is one of the President's wisest utterances. Every one knows that the present state of child-training is extremely precarious, that crimes committed by youths are increasing at a fearful rate, that vice and immorality taint many of America's young people,

and that we are drifting toward disaster. It has often been said that a course in religion introduced into the public school curriculum would undoubtedly help to remedy our present ailment. Large numbers of misguided, though well-meaning, enthusiasts insist on such a procedure, making every effort to influence state legislatures and municipal school boards in this direction. All these enthusiasts should note the presidential warning. The effort to introduce religious instruction into the public school tackles the problem at the wrong end. It shifts the responsibility for the breakdown of our youth from the home to the Government. The home is in the process of breaking down, hence the deplorable condition of our youth. The home must be reformed, and only when the home is doing its duty, will our youth recover. But the home will not recover unless the Church performs its share of the duty. When the churches neglect their own duties — and in this respect nearly all American denominations have most shamefully sinned — and calmly announce that it is the Government's business to train youth morally and religiously, is it not a sign of grave decay or spiritual weakness? Does not history teach us that churches which enter the political field do so when spiritual life is at low ebb? Are the churches of America really so impotent that they need a governmental subsidy to carry out their God-given program of child-training? Let the Church, also the Lutheran Church, awaken to its tremendous responsibility to its youth, and a reformation will come." DAU.

The American Legion, at its recent convention at Omaha, passed a series of resolutions which show that this body, too, once the paragon of martial patriotism of the type that disdains to ask any questions ("My country, right or wrong") has come under the sobering influences of the ever-growing chain of facts which *post bellum* investigations are bringing to light. We in America especially are supposed to have gone into this war from a pure sense of justice; for since we were not attacked and did not mean to get anything out of the war, our only motive for entering the war was our highly developed and exalted love of right. Even at the time of our entering there was indeed much in the state of our home affairs that might have furnished a basis for discounting our disinterestedness in this undertaking, but there can be no doubt that among the rank and file of our promptly conscripted army there were not a few who honestly believed that they went forth to fight embattled tyranny and moral monsters. The whole world rushed to arms first and postponed thinking until later. The Legion, too, is in the contemplative stage now. The men at Omaha visualized once more the horror of what they had gone through and deprecated the war enthusiasm of parlor warriors and the heroic sacrifices of childless ladies, who were fervently offering up every American mother's son on the altar of our country. The "buddies" who came back from Flanders Field found that they were not considered as noble after the armistice as before; that their altruism was questioned or pitied; that their cause went begging in a nation which a few months previously had declared: Nothing is too good for our boys. Many of them found their fortunes

wrecked upon their return and themselves and their dependents billeted upon the charity of their fellow-citizens. They saw that, while they had staked all and lost a good deal, thousands of others had not only lost nothing, but grown enormously rich — so rich that they were able to finance another war soon, and were willing for it too. The scandals of war profiteering filled the hearts of the men at Omaha with bitterness. One almost hears them muttering in their resolutions: Never again. If another conscription is ever attempted, we shall see to it that the draft is made universal. — The strangest utterance, however, in these Omaha resolutions is this: "We urge writers and teachers of the youth of our land to inculcate in their pupils an appreciation, not only of our own national virtues, but also of those of other nations and races, and an understanding with, and sympathy for, their glories and ideals." One hardly believes his eyes while reading this — from the American Legion. Sanity has returned at last. The days are over when the old German couple could not go to service in safety; when they were told by Councils of Defense that they ought to be ashamed of worshiping a German God; when the agents of the Department of Justice bobbed up in congregational meetings, and no one really was certain that his neighbor was not watching him by order of the Government; when Krause pined over the fault that he could never correct, *viz.,* that his name was not Hamilton or O'Rourke; when everything must be made English as rapidly as possible. Lutherans in the Middle West, in particular, will not easily forget those days, nor that other Lutherans were ready to act as informers against them. Many will say to the American Legion: Forget it; the less you think of it, the better you will feel. It's a question though whether, with the lessons of the past that were drilled into him, one can forget and be a true American patriot and plan wisely for his dear old Church. DAU.

Santa Claus. — Catholics have not lost the opportunity to claim this saint and a rather corrected activity for him. In an article by A. J. Beck, in *America,* of December 12, 1925, we read: "Among the most popular of the early saints of the Greek and Latin Church is St. Nicholas, whose feast is celebrated on December 6. While venerated by various classes, the saint became the special patron of children. In Germany, Switzerland, and Holland he figures to this day as the purveyor of gifts to children on his feast-day. . . . He acts as a sort of advance courier for the *Christkindlein,* examining into the conduct of the children, questioning the parents, warning some of the little ones, and then distributing goodies and promising to the boys and girls with good records a further reward which the Christ-child will bring them at Christmas. . . . The American child now attributes the tree to Santa Claus, while German Catholic children expect it from the Christ-child. Some of us use the term 'Kriss-kringle' as a synonym for Santa; in reality a corruption of *Christkindlein.* . . . Santa is perfectly unobjectionable — but in his place. That place is not the center of the Christmas-feast. He should be in the background, a minor actor in the great drama. The feast is Christmas, named for Christ, not 'Santa-mas.' . . . Here is a grand

opportunity for thoughtful, practical Catholics. They can 'Christianize,' as it were, this agent of materialism and secularism by telling the children of his Christian antecedents, by narrating the story of St. Nicholas, by using and calling for truly Christian Christmas-seals and -cards. . . . This will be a practical way of observing Advent, which is intended by the Church to be a preparation for the coming of the Christ-child. . . ." It would appear to us that the most practical way of really celebrating Advent, and the most effective method of keeping Christmas from becoming the "birthday of Santa Claus" and a festival of worldly gifts instead of the festival of the heavenly Gift, is to banish the "agent of materialism and secularism" entirely. The Christ-child can best be given His rightful place in the children's Christmas celebration if He is given the only place. MUELLER.

Sacramental Wine and the Eighteenth Amendment. — The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue have issued a new set of regulations concerning the sale of wine for sacramental purposes. Although general in scope, the force of the regulations is directed against the sale of wine to Jewish users. Significant is the fact, which has often been commented upon, that wine for the Sacrament is not a beverage and therefore not subject to the restriction of the Eighteenth Amendment; and these new restrictions, as well as others and in other phases of the prohibition enforcement, are, furthermore, projected by a subordinate department of government which has not legislative power. Thus it is that we can share the concern of *America* (December 12, 1925), which writes editorially: "It is not well to subject our religious rights, with which the Constitution forbids the President, or the whole Supreme Bench, or the 531 members of the Congress to meddle, to the hazard of control by a group of underlings, who, as the usage goes, hold their office as a reward for partisan political prowess. That the Jews may have consented to the new arrangement does not alter the fact that it was made for them in a matter not included in the Eighteenth Amendment by officials who have no right whatever to rule on questions of religious duties and requirements." MUELLER.

"Science and Health." — The cardinal principles of Christian Science, or Eddyism, dispense with, and oppose, the functions of the physician and all manner of therapy. As we read in *Science and Health:* "The ordinary practitioner, examining the bodily symptoms, telling the patient that he is sick, and treating the case according to his physical diagnosis, would naturally induce the very disease he is trying to cure." (p. 161, 24.) "The seeming disease, caused by a majority of human beliefs that man must die or produced by mental assassins, does not in the least disprove Christian Science." (p. 164, 18.) "Christian Science rises above the evidence of the corporeal senses." (p. 448, 12.) "A Christian Scientist never recommends material hygiene." (p. 453, 30.) "Man is not matter; he is not made up of brain, blood, bones, and other material elements." (p. 475, 6.) The appalling results of this teaching in many instances

are well summarized by Riley, Peabody, and Humiston, the psychologist, lawyer, and physician, who have recently published an effective refutation of the cult; *Faith, Falsity, Failure, of Christian Science:* "Let it never be forgotten that, to many thousands, Christian Science has meant the tragedy of needless suffering and premature death; and when helpless children have been similarly victimized, the crime is one that calls for retribution, swift and sure." (p. 262.) "From the medical standpoint, Christian Science, as a system of treating human ailments, is thus seen to be cruel *failure*. . . . The worst that should be said of it cannot be uttered, as mere words are wholly inadequate to depict the iniquity of this nefarious traffic in human life. Christian Science, shorn of its mask of religion, stalks forth the arch-demon of the medical underworld. The nearest to a true estimate of the value of this fake therapeutic agent is recorded only in the church-yard. Christian Science is an assassin of humanity. To every form of human misery it brings its one offering — arrogant, boastful, criminal ignorance. It obtrudes its hateful presence between suffering humanity and the only known means of relief. It supplants surgery with sorcery and tender solicitude with brutal neglect. With hostile mien it stands guard against curative medicine at the bedside of childhood while death strikes down the helpless babe. Christian Science is the advance agent of scourge and pestilence, the ally of smallpox and consumption, the confederate of appendicitis and typhoid fever, and the executioner for cancer and intestinal obstruction. Against every victory of scientific medicine, Christian Science makes angry protest." (p. 403.) Coming from authorities in their respective professions, this indictment of the external danger of Christian Scientism is noteworthy. MUELLER.

Hesitating to Confess Christ. — In his sermon on this theme, in his new volume *Soul-winning Sermons,* Dr. R. A. Torrey, the noted evangelist, presents his treatment of those who hesitate to confess Christ; and the passage is worth quoting in these pages. After stating that he has "yet to find the first honest skeptic, infidel, atheist, agnostic, Unitarian, or Spiritualist who really wished to know and obey the truth, whom I could not show a way to find out that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and the Bible the Word of God," Dr. Torrey proceeds to give his method in an illustration: "There was a man in my congregation who was a constant attendant, but who had not publicly confessed Christ before the world. His wife and his daughter were members of our church, but he was not. One Sunday night as I was going out of the building, he stood between the two doors, and I stepped up to him and said, 'Mr. B., why are you not a Christian?' He instantly replied, 'Because I don't believe anything.' He went on to say, 'I do not boast of it as so many men in this town do, but I don't believe anything.' I said to him, 'Do you not believe there is a God?' Hesitatingly he replied, 'Yes, I believe there is a God; I have not quite given up faith that there is a God. I believe there is a Supreme Being.' 'Well,' I said, 'if there is a God, a Supreme Being, as you call Him, you ought to surrender your will to His. You ought to take your stand upon His will to follow it

wherever it carries you. Have you done that?' He replied, 'I am trying to live just as near right as I know how.' I replied, 'That is not what I asked you. I asked you if you had taken your stand upon the will of God to follow it wherever it carried you.' He answered, 'I have never put it just that way.' I said, 'Will you put it that way to-night?' He said, 'I will.' 'Now,' I said, 'do you believe God answers prayer?' 'No,' he said, 'I do not. I have lain awake nights thinking about that, and I have about come to the conclusion that God does not answer prayer.' 'Well,' I said, 'I know He does, but that will not do you any good. But you can find out for yourself. Will you pray this prayer, "O God, show me if Jesus Christ is Thy Son or not, and if Thou showest me that He is, I promise to accept Him as my Savior and confess Him as such before the world"?' He said, 'Yes, I will do that too.'" The speaker continues to say that within a week the man, who had honestly fulfilled his promise, made a public confession of his faith, united with the church, became active in its work, and fell asleep in faith. The passage concludes: "Do you doubt that story? Well, try it yourself; then you will have one of your own to tell. It has been tried by a countless multitude. It has never failed, and it never will; for Jesus Christ Himself says, John 7, 17: 'If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the teaching whether it is of God or whether I speak of Myself.'" MUELLER.

"The Revolt of Modern Youth." — This is the title of a new book by Judge Ben. B. Lindsey, of Denver, Colo. The famous judge, who is one of the originators of the Juvenile Court idea, is representative of the most advanced sociological ideas, which find expression also in this book. The author realizes the dangers threatening modern young people and speaks sound words in regard to the laxity of home influence, which is the foundation of most of these dangers. But the gist of his solution for the problem of the "revolt of modern youth" is: loosened standards and restrictions; more tolerance toward divorce, youthful indiscretions, and the breaking down of sexual morality; as *America,* of December 12, 1925, has it: "Briefly, his theory is that sin and disorder can be effectively checked by terming the one virtue and the other liberty." The author can do this because it is no longer necessary to gain moral sanctions from a higher law, but the individual case is the only guide for behavior; right and wrong are not absolute terms; in fact, they do not exist. God and His Ten Commandments are out of date for the modern social worker. The fruits of such teaching are already becoming evident. It behooves us to guard jealously our dependence upon our "objective standard of morality," as the above-mentioned editorial calls it, and be thankful that we may be dependent upon it. MUELLER.

Bryan and the Bible. — The new biography of William Jennings Bryan which has recently appeared from the pens of G. F. and J. O. Herrich prompts us to cite a few more direct testimonies of Bryan which he made under fire on the witness stand to the sureness of his faith in Bible-truth. There were several points of weakness in

that testimony, such as the admission that the six days of the Creation were not six days of twenty-four hours, but "periods," of whose length he had no idea, Creation continuing "for millions of years." This instance was an unfortunate inconsistency in view of the general force of Mr. Bryan's replies to the caustic Darrow. To the sneering question concerning the story of Jonah and the "whale," Bryan said: "I believe in a God who can make a whale and can make a man and make both do what He pleases." *Question:* "You believe that the big fish was made to swallow Jonah?" *Answer:* "I am not prepared to say that; the Bible merely says it was done. The Bible says so. The Bible doesn't make as extreme statements as evolutionists do." Questioned with regard to Joshua and the standing still of the sun, whether "the men who wrote it thought that the day could be lengthened or that the sun could be stopped," he said: "I don't know what they thought. I think they wrote the fact without expressing their own thoughts. I believe the Bible is inspired and written by inspired authors. Whether the one who wrote as he was directed to write understood the things he was writing about, I don't know." *Q.:* "You believe the story of the Flood to be a literal interpretation?" *A.:* "Yes, sir." ... *Q.:* "About 2400 B. C.?" *A.:* "That has been the estimate of a man that is accepted to-day. I would not say it is accurate." . . . *Q.:* "Do you believe that the first woman was Eve?" *A.:* "Yes." *Q.:* "Do you believe that after Eve ate the apple or gave it to Adam, — whichever way it was, — God cursed Eve and at that time decreed that all womankind henceforth and forever should suffer the pains of childbirth in the reproduction of the earth?" *A.:* "I will believe just what the Bible says. . . . I believe the Bible as it is, and I do not permit you to put your language in the place of the language of the Almighty. You read that Bible and ask me questions, and I will answer them. I will not answer your questions in your language." Other examples could be cited from the court record. In the words of the biographers: "Bryan's faith had been submitted to a test of fire. Men will judge according to their views as to which of the two mighty contestants won the advantage. Suffice it that the champion of revealed religion had had the courage of his conviction, that he had submitted readily to an inquisition by one of the keenest legal minds in the country." The purpose of this submission Bryan stated: "It is to keep these gentlemen from saying I was afraid to meet them and let them question me; and I want the Christian world to know that any atheist, agnostic, unbeliever, can question me any time as to my belief in God, and I will answer him." MUELLER.

Another testimony against Higher Criticism has recently been published by C. C. Taylor, A. M., B. D., Professor of Historical and Systematic Theology in Phillips University, in his Old Testament study *The Purpose of God.* In a sensible and logical manner he summarizes, in the chapter on "Criticism," the flimsiness of the critical theory: "The basic principle in the critical theory, and the one that gave rise, seemingly, to the whole critical procession, is the claim that two documents can be traced in Genesis by the use of

the two names 'Elohim' and 'Jehovah,' and that this documentary hypothesis is further supported by differences of style even to the use of different vocabularies. The truth is that the word 'Elohim' is repeatedly found in the sections attributed to J, where only Jehovah ought to be found; also, Jehovah is found in sections attributed to E, where only Elohim ought to be found. The critics explain this by saying that at times the author used both names as occasion demanded. They thus surrender their own most vital contention; for this is the true explanation, that *Moses* used both words as occasion demanded. 'Elohim' was the name used for God in the most general sense — God of all the nations, Creator of heaven and earth. But as the God of Israel He was known as 'Jehovah.' In identifying Jehovah as the God of all the world, the words were combined in the phrase 'Jehovah God.' According to the argument of the critics, if a man was to write an article to-day, using the words 'God,' 'Lord,' 'Jehovah,' 'the Deity,' and like terms, the article would be declared to be composed of as many documents, written by as many different persons as there were terms used in reference to God. This, of course, is absurd. That almost any narrative can be divided into different documents has been illustrated by William Henry Green, by dividing the well-known parables, the prodigal son and the good Samaritan, each into two parts. On the similar ground of difference in style the Epistle to the Romans has been dissected into four parts as an illustration of the futility of this argument of the critics. Since any brief, simple narrative, whose unity is not questioned, can be similarly dissected, the argument based on this contention falls." (p. 282.)

MUELLER.

Archeological References to Joseph. — The new edition of Dr. Ira Price's book *The Monuments and the Old Testament,* among much other interesting material on practically every phase of the Old Testament, presents several interesting facts concerning Egyptian conditions, which shed light on the unusual and much-maligned story of Joseph. We see that the story of Joseph, even in its dramatic features, is possible and that the narrative is written with exact knowledge of Egyptian customs and practises. "The fact that Joseph shaved himself before appearing before the great monarch betrays the Egyptian origin of the story; for this custom has always been abhorred by Semitic peoples. . . . In accordance with known Egyptian court proceedings, he is formally installed as prime minister over Egypt. The seal-ring, or signet, presented to him was a stone, or flat surface, of gold, engraved for stamping upon soft material. . . . Tomkins calls attention to a remarkable one in the collection of M. Allemant. It is of black jasper, graven in intaglio on both sides. On the front there is a winged serpent and two Semitic signs; on the back a *Hebrew* inscription, dating from the Hyksos kings of the seventeenth dynasty. . . . Tomkins quotes de Rouge's description of Antef, prime minister (= first deputy of the king). Joseph's authority seems to be almost paralleled by that conferred on this prime minister. . . . The collar of gold with which Joseph was decorated was one of the marks of distinction among Egyptian

officials. He was also to ride in the second royal chariot of the king, and in his progress through the land a word, *abrek,* either Babylonian *abarakku,* 'ruler,' or Egyptian, 'attention,' was called out before him by a runner. . . . It is eminently plausible that a foreign Semite could have been promoted to the position of prime minister, if the ruling sovereigns were Asiatics and Semites, as the Hyksos probably were. That a foreigner would be promoted to a high position in Egypt during the Empire (1580—945 B. C.) is already attested. A similar case to that of Joseph is related in the Amarna letters, in which a high Egyptian official by the name of Jauhamu, a Semite, was made commissioner of grain storehouses at Jarimuta, which was available for Phenician harbor cities." (pp. 177—179.) Concerning the famine: "Periods of distress of this kind had occurred on account of the failure of the annual rise of the Nile from prehistoric times. . . . There is a record of one famine which many, among them Brugsch, have identified with the time of Joseph. In a tomb at El-Kab an inscription of the governor, named Baba, states that he, in the great famine which came upon his people, dealt out to them grain which he had stored away in times of plenty. Brugsch says Baba lived about the time that Joseph exercised his office, under one of the Hyksos kings, holding office under the native king Ra-Sekenem Taa III in the old town of El-Kab. The only just conclusion is that the many years of famine in the time of Baba must precisely correspond with the seven years of famine under Joseph's Pharaoh, one of the Shepherd-kings." MUELLER.

Glimpses from the Observer's Window. — "That unconscious hypocrisy which enables the Englishman to further his own ends and call it serving God," this is what Joseph Krutch says is the net result of Bernard Shaw's study of British character. It is to be feared that the trait extends beyond the confines of the British Isles.

Two instances of justice administered by a court: Spite of dexterous pleading the jury refuses to believe that the union between Rhinelander and his wife, in whom faint traces of Negro blood had been discovered, is "unnatural" and refuses to grant a decree of separation. — At the Matteotti murder trial the Italian Court of Public Prosecutions, in advance of the actual trial in January, exonerates all the accused in advance of the charge of premeditated murder and thus rules out evidence that would be submitted at the trial.

The movement against military training at our high schools and colleges is nation-wide, now that a revolt has broken out at the University of Washington.

The plea for entering the World Court by the United States strikes some as a case of getting married with reservations and as being just as perplexing: you do not know whether the reservations are as binding as the marriage.

Alcide Ebray, a doughty Frenchman, who has written two books: *Le Crime de 1914–18* and *Chiffons de Papier,* in which he demolishes the once popular theories of war origins, now is out in a third book, *La Paix Malpropre.* An American reviewer renders the title of the last-named book "The Unclean Peace." "Unclean" is a fine euphemism.

It is suggested that the further publication of William Edward Hall's *Treatise on International Law,* now out in its eighth edition, be stopped, because the book has been filled with so many "patriotic" footnotes as to lose its scientific value. Says the *Nation:* "One could hardly gather from

the text or from the notes that a very considerable number of the so-called laws of war for the protection of neutrals were egregiously violated by the British Government in the late war, to the permanent injury of international law as a moderator of unrestrained force."

Histories for use in schools are now written as "intended for adolescents." The "unknown powers" within the animal man are exhibited in these histories.

"The net was cast into the vast sea of humanity, and I may say here that it fell to my lot to sit down on the shore and inspect it when John Alexander Dowie drew it to shore. Much of my time for years has been spent in separating the good and the bad." (From a sermon of Wilbur Glenn Voliva on June 14.) This is rather rough on poor Dowie, who cannot "talk back"; but it must have been highly edifying to the present members of the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion, who may consider themselves hand-picked.

The Dutch legation at the Holy See has been suppressed, because, says the *Commonweal*, "it placed a Catholic label upon a predominantly Calvinist people."

The Golden Rose has just been bestowed upon Queen Elizabeth of Belgium. When the late Empress Eugenie of France received it, she remarked that the gift, as a rule, did not bring happiness to crowned heads, and she may have been thinking of Queen Isabella of Spain, the Empress of Austria, the Queen of Naples, Queen Isabella of Portugal.

An extensive "Report of the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work," covering nearly four pages, partly in close print, in the *Lutheran* for December 17, 1925, gives a very illuminating digest of what actually happened at Stockholm and of the impressions which were made upon the reporters of the *Lutheran* by the action taken at Stockholm. It appears that in a retrospect the Stockholm Conference loses considerably in the estimation of some who attended it. The early period of gush and enthusiasm seems to be over, and the period of soberly viewing realities is beginning. This is a good sign. But it is no guarantee that some good Lutherans will not fall for the next deception that may come along.

Rev. C. H. Bernheim, concerning whom the *Lutheran* on December 17, 1925, says that he organized the Bethlehem Ev. Luth. Church in 1859, and that this was the oldest congregation in Florida belonging to the Georgia Synod, is the same person that became instrumental in introducing the Missouri Synod at Conover, N. C. He died a member of the Missouri Synod.

A native newspaper, under Catholic auspices, has been started in China to counteract Soviet influences. Two more are to follow.

At a meeting of college presidents the "prexy" of Dartmouth, famous in football, brought down the house when he said that he could avoid the subject of Dartmouth athletics because they spoke for themselves. . . . "Red" Grange has been sighed over, pitied, and denounced. But we doubt if any of the college presidents noticed a little item which appeared in an Eastern newspaper: "Mr. —— is home with his parents from —— college, where he is a stellar half-back. Having wrenched his knee in the game with ——, he feels it would not be worth while going to school until next fall, when he can get back into the game." We wondered a little at the singular indifference of this hero to professors and credits until we showed the item to a friendly sports-writer. He told us he could get a hundred clippings to match. We really are most interested in seeing how long our *alma maters* are going to float the biggest bluff in academic history. We are scanning the horizon for an honest president who will say: "Gentlemen, the amount we expended this year on football was so much; the receipts were so much. The balance is therefore very encouraging." Nothing would be more likely to make a favorable impression upon the trustees. (*The Commonweal*, January 27.) It is common knowledge that the mainstay of athletics at our American colleges and universities are not the athletes among the students. These are always in an overwhelming

minority, and not infrequently they are imported and carry only a light schedule of studies to give them standing as students. But they are 1) the idle rich — a public nuisance in any place they infest —; 2) the alumni; 3) the boards of trustees, who want fame for their school at any price and from any source. With these people the real power of the university is the coach.

The *Osservatore Romano*, the official Vatican organ, is beginning to feel sorry for the Pope's "beloved son," Benito Mussolini, who wants to restore Rome to its ancient grandeur, with himself as the modern Caesar Augustus.

The forces opposing compulsory military training in our schools and colleges have been increased by the Interdenominational Student Conference at Evanston, Ill., the Cleveland Board of Education (against the advice of Newton D. Baker), the Woman's Board of Foreign Missions, in convention at Atlantic City, and by Prof. W. B. Otis, of the College of the City of New York. His resignation has been called for by the National Securities League. Militarists and "patriotic" organizations are becoming increasingly indignant. DAU.

BOOK REVIEW.

Lutheran School Journal. An Educational Monthly. Published by the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. $1.50 per annum in advance. December, 1925. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The December, 1925, issue of the *School Journal* is a Jubilee Number. This *Journal* — until a few years ago known as *Schulblatt* — has been issued for a period of sixty years. It is edited by an editorial committee of the Faculty of Concordia Teachers' College, River Forest, Ill., and is devoted to the interests of the Christian education of children, particularly that given by the parochial school. There is no doubt that much of the sound Lutheranism which is found in the members of our churches is due to the Christian education which many of them have received in our Christian schools. We desire to improve this opportunity not only to encourage our pastors to subscribe for, and read, our *School Journal*, — that our teachers do so is self-evident, — but also to encourage them to recommend this *School Journal* to the more intelligent members of their churches, especially to the members of their school boards. FRITZ.

Sabbatarianism and Immersionism. By *O. Boettcher.* Tract No. 98. 22 pages. 10 cts.; dozen, 96 cts., and postage. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

We cannot give this tract a better recommendation for general distribution than that given it by Professor Graebner in an "Introduction" printed on the reverse side of the title-page. Professor Graebner says: "This tract was written by one who in his ministry has had many a hard conflict with Sabbatarian and Immersionist proselyters and who has learned by experience the best methods of meeting their arguments. In the summer of 1924 I heard Rev. Boettcher instruct a younger brother in the line of argument serviceable for dispelling the fog of uncertainty and doubt which sectarians are frequently able to raise in the minds of Lu-

theran Christians regarding these two doctrines, the Sabbath and Baptism. So lucid and simple was the exposition of the Scriptural argument as presented by Rev. Boettcher on this occasion, and so well versed in the opposing view did he show himself to be, that I later requested him to contribute a series of articles to the *Lutheran Witness*. The articles appeared in the fall of 1924 and in the spring of 1925 and are herewith reprinted with only slight changes. To those brethren in the ministry who have been fortunate enough to escape Sabbatarian and Immersionist propaganda in their congregations the need of such a tract as this may not be at once apparent. To those who have been exposed to the proselyting activity of Baptists, Seventh-day Adventists, Disciples (Christian Church, Campbellites), Pentecostals, Holy Rollers, and other sectarians, Rev. Boettcher's tract will be very welcome indeed." FRITZ.

Russellism. By *Karl Linsenmann*. Tract No. 100. 16 pages. 10 cts.; dozen, 96 cts., and postage. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Wherever our pastors have occasion to enlighten any one on Russellism, or where a whole community is troubled by this religious sect, Pastor Linsenmann's tract will serve a good purpose. FRITZ.

Which Church Shall I Join? By *Martin S. Sommer*. Tract No. 99. 15 pages. 3 cts.; per dozen, 30 cts.; 100, $2.00, and postage. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This tract may be used by pastors in their mission-work and when instructing adult classes. The right and simple answer is given to a question which some might think to be a perplexing one. FRITZ.

Word Pictures of Bible Events. By *Wm. Moenkemoeller*. 95 pages.

On the basis of the Bible record the author offers thirty-five meditations from the Creation to the death of Moses, covering the contents of Genesis. The meditations are good aids to private Bible-study. DAU.

Das Buch des Lebens. Von *Ernst Eckhardt*. 47 pages. 25 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis.)

This is a practical treatise on the meaning and scope of the texts in which the term "book of life" occurs in Scripture. DAU.

The Relation between Science and Theology. By *C. Stuart Gager*. 87 pages, 5×8. $1.00. (The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill.)

The final paragraph of this book characterizes the book itself. The author says: "Finally, to whatever extent we seek for guidance from others in matters of both knowledge and faith, let us never lose sight of the wisdom of leaving it to the theologians to find out where we are going to, but to the evolutionists to find out where we came from." This is rather poor advice, for if the Bible — from which the theologian ought to take his theology — is not reliable when it tells us where we came from, how can we trust it when it tells us where we are going to? In reference to the latter the author says: "Just as science has made wonderful progress on the basis of working hypotheses, so may one progress in a satisfying religious life by accepting immortality as a working hypothesis —

by accepting it as *true* until it is disproved." Again he says: "Thus the teaching of the resurrection of the material bodies of men, as affirmed in the Apostles' Creed, contrary to the teaching of St. Paul, is believed to be the teaching of Scriptures by many who are also ignorant that the so-called Apostles' Creed was not formulated for several centuries after the death of all the apostles." In a footnote the author quotes Paul's words: "'So also is the resurrection of the dead.... It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.' 1 Cor. 15, 42. 44." Why is it that the fact is overlooked that the distinction which the apostle makes is that between a natural body and a spiritual body, but that in each case he speaks of a *body?* In other words, the apostle teaches in these very words a *bodily* resurrection. The false interpretation given to Paul's words reminds us of what Peter said. Referring to Paul's epistles, he wrote: "In which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction." 2 Pet. 3, 16. To pit science against the revealed Word of God is starting with the wrong premises. When studying the world, men may, because of insufficient observation and knowledge on their part, in their findings see a conflict with the clear statements of the Bible; but *real* science, that is, knowledge based upon actual facts and not upon mere hypotheses, does not conflict with revealed religion. Revealed religion is a definite and fixed quantity, giving us unchangeable truths, while science, in the sense of human investigation, is not. As to spiritual things, science, as the term is commonly used, cannot give us reliable information; for what the human mind can know in the spiritual realm, beyond mere natural religion, it can know only on the basis of what God has revealed in His Word. All so-called scientific research in the world could never have correctly answered the question, "What must I do to be saved?" It is for this reason that the Bible is the only religious book which to this question gives the answer, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Why the findings of "science" have been different at different times, and why they are not absolutely reliable, the author of the book which is being reviewed himself states when he says: "Moreover, the ability to observe and describe accurately was only gradually acquired by the human race. Early accounts of natural phenomena are filled, not only with inaccurate, but with bizarre and even positively misleading and untruthful accounts of what purports to have been observed — the Scythian lamb, for example, goose-barnacles, and other imagined realities of early 'science.' It took men centuries to learn that they must sharply distinguish between what really did occur, and what they thought would or ought to occur — or what they wished to occur." Over against this it must be said that in the Bible we have God's absolute truth, which does not and cannot change in the course of years and therefore is absolutely reliable. Even "science" itself has helped to confirm this, as when, for instance, certain statements of the Bible which formerly were said not to be historically true have by recent excavations been substantiated. In his book *Modernism*, Bloore, in an appendix, calls attention to some of the critical blunders of science. He says: "These have been exposed from many sources in recent years, and volumes have been written giving in detail the many confirmations of Scriptures which have come through the patient

labor of many hands." He then proceeds to give a few samples, as, for instance: "The Hittites mentioned in Scripture were once an object of critical ridicule. There was no confirmation from other sources of such a people or empire. The Bible must be wrong. But recent discoveries have proved their existence as a nation of considerable prominence, and the Scriptural references to them have been confirmed." "The critics were accustomed to ridicule Daniel as unhistorical because of reference to Belshazzar and certain official titles which he mentions, but discovered tablets and monumental inscriptions have proved their correctness."

Summa summarum, we shall do well if we stick to our good old Bible; it has never disappointed us and never will; it is God's own everlasting truth. Says Jesus: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away." Matt. 24, 35. FRITZ.

The Church-Year. Studies in the Introits, Collects, Epistles, and Gospels. By *Paul Zeller Strodach.* 265 pages, 5½×8. $2.00. (The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

In announcing this book, the publishers say: "Dr. Paul Z. Strodach, lover of his subject and equipped by much study and by membership in the committee that prepared the Common Service Book, has done something unique in this volume. In the light of the life of Christ and of the Church he has described, week by week and event by event, the church-year. The result is a manual for devotion, an interpretation of the lessons in relation to the reason for their selection, and rare information about liturgical customs." The author says: "The purpose of the year was to foster devotion; to give expression to the Church's worship; to serve to instruct, not to govern or enslave. It must be Christocentric as much when it recalls His birth or resurrection as when the Church is born or one of His followers seals his faith with his blood. It is to be not only the Church's year, but her Lord's year. Considered in this light, the church-year has a definite purpose in view and is logical and harmonious in structure." Pastors will do well to purchase this book and carefully read and study that particular portion which refers to the Sunday or festival for which they are preparing their sermon. Our congregations ought to have more knowledge of the purpose of the pericopes, introits, collects, etc., of the church-year than the mere superficial knowledge which the average church-member has, if he has any at all. On the basis of this book, pastors could in their sermons and in special lectures point out many an interesting and important fact, which would make both for a more intelligent and for a more profitable use of the beautiful liturgy used in our Lutheran Church. FRITZ.

The Family. A Study Book for Groups and Individuals. Prepared by the Committee on Moral and Social Welfare of the United Lutheran Church. 83 pages, 5¼×7¾. 40 cts. (The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The increasingly sad condition of the Church of our country and the resultant breaking down of morality and civilization are largely due to the fact that the purpose, the duties, the responsibilities, and the importance

of the basic social unit, the family, or the home, are by an increasingly large number of people not understood, not appreciated, and not acted upon. The purpose of the book called *The Family* can be learned from such quotations as these: "The strength of the nation depends upon the moral character of those who compose its families. The homes of our land will always determine what the future of the country is to be. The integrity of the family is absolutely essential to the security of the State." "If we would strengthen the Church, we must strengthen the home and its teaching. The Christian family is the most potent factor in the redemptive forces of the human race. The virtues which spring up in Christian homes are the healing balm of civilization. Every Christian home is the focus of light and warmth for the social whole. The family must be exalted as the most effective unit in the development of a newer and better Christian civilization." Three chapters in the book are devoted to the discussion of Divorce, Causes of Divorce, and Marriage and Divorce Laws. It is in this connection that the author says: "The fetish of our time is legislative enactment. It is considered that men should be more moral, more temperate; immediately a party arises in the State, clamoring for a law to legalize its theories.... You can make men hypocrites by prohibitory laws; you cannot make them moral." The author also speaks of the changed conditions of the times in which we are living and of their bearing upon the life of the family. The book is well written and is provocative of thought on a subject which deserves much more attention than it receives.

FRITZ.

The Christ-Child. A Christmas cantata for soprano, alto, and tenor, solos, chorus, and organ. Music by *J. F. Ohl.* 52 pages. 60 cts.; dozen, $6.00. (The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa.)

This is an easy Christmas cantata which choirmasters might well keep in mind, sending for a sample copy before the holiday season again arrives.

FRITZ.

Studies in the Life of the Early Church. By *F. J. Foakes-Jackson.* 263 pages. (George H. Doran Co., New York.)

The twenty-five chapters of this book by the Professor of Christian Institutions in Union Theological Seminary cover the period of primitive Christianity to the accession of Constantine. It traces the origin of dogmas and institutions still recognized in the Christian Church. It will render good service to a person wanting to review the first three centuries of the Christian Church.

DAU.

Science as Revelation. By *John M. Watson.* 303 pages. (The Macmillan Co., New York.)

The arrangement of the contents of this book remind one of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales,* in which the reader gets a fine picture of fourteenth-century England from the talks of the pilgrims belonging to various social strata and pursuits. The author's main aim is to show that nature is a "dependable revelation of the divine way and will." He introduces representatives of the various departments of natural science ("The Astronomer Speaks," "The Physicist Speaks," "The Chemist Speaks," etc.), ten groups in all, and makes them tell what their science has revealed to

them concerning God. Bearing in mind Rom. 1, 19. 20, one is compelled to say that a study of this kind can be reverently pursued, and with a distinct profit to the believing soul. Numerous attempts of this kind have been made by devout Christians, as, for instance, in our circles by the late Rev. Weseloh in his *Herrlichkeit Gottes in der Natur*. Such studies have not taken men away from the written revelation of God in the Bible and its distinctive authority. But the book before us aims at making all revelation of God conformable to that which is conveyed by nature. The author is looking forward to a New Religion of Universal Truth, which will be a symphony of truth, in which the voices of mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology, psychology, as well as the spiritual truths of ethics and religion taught by Jesus of Nazareth, will be blended in a grand harmony. It is to be feared that there will be a jarring discord if a member of this orchestra should try to play the *andante maestoso* from 1 Cor. 2, 14. Evolution is accorded a large influence in the New Religion portrayed in this book. DAU.

The World's Great Religious Poetry. Edited by *Caroline Miles Hill, Ph. D.* 836 pages, 8¼×5½. Cloth, $2.50. (Macmillan Co., New York.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

According to the announcement of the publishers, this book contains a "collection of religious poems covering the entire range of ancient and modern literature." The contents have been arranged under twelve general heads, *viz.*, Inspiration, The Search after God, The Existence and Idea of God, Faith, God in Nature, Prayers, Worship, Comfort in Sorrow, Conduct of Life, Death and Immortality, The Nature of the Future Life. There are 836 closely filled pages, including the Introduction, Table of Contents, and Index of Titles and Authors.

This anthology makes no pretense at being Christian and is therefore rightly named religious — in its widest sense. However, a very large number of the best Christian poems of all ages is included. While one misses some old favorites, one finds other lesser known gems by way of compensation; to mention just one, the English translation of Clement's hymn, of which "Shepherd of Tender Youth" in our hymn-book is a metrical paraphrase. The collection will serve as a splendid reference work. Many poems are made available which would otherwise be difficult to obtain. Naturally, in a collection of this nature it strikes one as odd to find our gems of Christian poetry in such strange company as Omar Khayyam, Brahma, Buddha, Seneca, etc., and yet there is this value in it, that in the contrast the serenity and majesty of that which is truly Christian stands out prominently.

The compiler seems to have been happy in her selection of English translations. This is particularly true of Luther's "Ein' feste Burg" and Gerhardt's "Befiehl du deine Wege."

Sometimes her selections have not been the best. "To wander through the aisles of this great cathedral of music and song" and to find a piece like Carl Sandburg's diatribe, "To a Contemporary Bunkshooter," is like walking through a real cathedral and stumbling upon a pile of refuse which a negligent janitor failed to remove. W. G. P.